

Please replace the paragraph at page 29, lines 16-22 with the following:

B<sup>2</sup>  
From the results of Table 1, in Examples 1 and 2 in which a matrix material is a crosslinked polymer, a pore is formed in the better state even after dressing. The breaking remaining elongation of matrix materials used in these polishing pads were all 0%, and it can be seen that no elongation after breaking is perceived. It can be seen that the removal rate is as high as 190 to 250 nm/min. in such the polishing pad.

Please replace the paragraph bridging pages 29 and 30 with the following:

B<sup>3</sup>  
To the contrary, in Comparative Example 1, a non-crosslinked thermoplastic resin was used as a matrix material. It can be seen that this non-crosslinked thermoplastic resin has the very large breaking remaining elongation of 510% and, therefore, ductility. In addition, a part of pore was choked by dressing. Therefore, the removal rate is 60 nm/min. being 32% of that in Example 1 and 24% of that in Example 2. On the other hand, in Comparative Example 2, since a matrix material used in Examples 1 and 2 is used as a non-crosslinked material, the sample has not the elastic recovery. For this reason, the breaking remaining elongation is as large as 220%. In addition, a part of pore was choked by dressing. Therefore, the removal rate is 10 nm/min., being 5% of that of Example 1 and 4% of that of Example 2.

#### DISCUSSION OF THE AMENDMENT

The specification has been amended by replacing the term " $\mu\text{m}/\text{min}.$ " with  
--nm/min.--.